



BLM - Elko, NV  
Determination of NEPA Adequacy  
DNA

<b>Proposed Action Project Title/Type</b> <i>Ormat Buried Fiber Optic Tie-in</i>	
<b>Originating Office:</b> Tuscarora Field Office	<b>Requested Priority:</b>
<b>Authorizing Office:</b> Tuscarora Field Office	<b>Priority Assigned:</b>
<b>NEPA # (Assigned in ePlanning): - DOI-BLM-NV-N020-2014-0005-DNA</b>	
<b>Case File No.:</b> NVN-092746	<b>Date:</b> 6/23/2014
<b>Type of Action (Subject Code):</b> 2800	<b>Applicant/Cooperator (if any):</b> Ormat Nevada Inc.
<b>County, General Location, UTM, or Legal Description:</b> Elko, NV; T. 39N., R. 53E., Sec. 35, NESW; 41° 13.41N 115° 58.77E	
<b>A. NEPA Geodatabase Information Submitted to GIS:</b> <i>ePath:</i>	
<b>B. Description of Proposed Action</b> Ormat proposes to install a buried fiber optic cable along Highway 226 to Tuscarora. Ormat's Tuscarora geothermal power plant has an existing fiber optic line mounted on its power transmission poles and would like to tie-in to the RTC cable (NVN89216) so plant communications will be more reliable. Ormat and RTC have identified a location for the interconnection along HWY 226 where both the lines will be in close proximity. A spur will be run from RTC main cable, under HWY 226, to a "hand hole" located at the boundary between the NDOT ROW and BLM lands. The required permits will be obtained from NDOT to operate within their ROW. Ormat is requesting a 390 ft. long by 20 ft. wide ROW which will be entirely on Federal Lands administered by the BLM Tuscarora FO. The proposed ROW would have approximately 0.179 acres of disturbance. The cable will be installed adjacent to an existing disturbed road/track on a gentle alluvium covered slope. The area is sparsely vegetated with sagebrush and grasses and has been previously disturbed. A trenching machine will be used to dig a 3 to 4 deep trench that will be up to 6 inches wide. A narrow-bucket mini-excavator may also be used to trench and/or backfill the trench to minimize surface disturbance. No clearing or grading of the proposed route would be needed. All construction will require less than a week to complete. There is an existing dirt access road leading from the highway to the power pole, along which most of the cable will be placed. No other access is required. The NDOT wire fence along their ROW boundary will be temporarily opened to allow site access. Following installation the trench will be immediately backfilled and all disturbed areas will be seeded with a seed mix similar to that used for the Ormat Transmission Line project.	

**C. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

LUP Name/Date Approved: (list applicable LUPs (e.g., resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto).

☒ Elko Resource Area Resource Management Plan, 1986  
Elko Resource Area Resource Management Plan Record of Decision, 1987

☐ Wells Resource Area Resource Management Plan, 1983  
Wells Resource Area Resource Management Plan Record of Decision, 1985

Other Document/Date Approved [Click here to enter text.](#)

Other Document/Date Approved

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

**OR**

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

**The Elko Resource Management Plan, as approved March 11, 1987, is silent on the Proposed Action. However, it is consistent with the objectives for the management of lands, right-of-way corridors, access, recreation, livestock management, wildlife, and minerals as prescribed and identified in the Record of Decision of the Resource Management Plan (BLM 1987, p.1-4).**

*Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.*

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Environmental Assessment BLM/EK/PL-2008/010 Hot Sulphur Springs Transmission Line, March 2008; Environmental Assessment DOE/EA-1849 Ormat Nevada Northern Nevada Geothermal Power Plant Projects, August 2011; Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-NV-E020-2011-0501-EA Telecommunications Fiber Optic Lines: Tuscarora to Lone Mountain Station & Dinner Station to Adobe Ranchos, January 2012.

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

*Documentation of answer and explanation:*

**Yes, the proposed action would be a feature of Ormat's existing Hot Sulfur Springs transmission line. A short, 390-foot-long segment of buried fiber optic line that would connect the existing fiber optic line, mounted on Ormat's power transmission poles on the north side of Highway 226, to an existing buried fiber optic line on the Southside of the highway that was installed by Rural Telephone Company. Of the 390ft ROW being requested 160ft have already been bored under the highway and a spur installed from RTC cable to a hand hole located within the ROW for Highway 226. RTC cable to which the spur connects was analyzed in Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-NV-E020-2011-0501-EA (2012). An additional 75ft of the proposed action lie within Ormat's Hot Sulfur Springs transmission line which was analyzed in Environmental Assessment BLM/EK/PL-2008/010 (2008) and Environmental Assessment DOE/EA-1849 (2011). Of the proposed action 155ft (.071 acres) are outside of an existing ROW or area analyzed in an existing NEPA document. However the project area geographic and resource conditions are sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.**

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

*Documentation of answer and explanation:*

**Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed is still appropriate; however the sensitive species Sage-grouse is still a concern in this area. Even though the proposed action will be within an already disturbed 4wd road, our guidance is to work directly with NDOW for all ground disturbing projects. We have worked with NDOW and will be using stipulations in the right-of-way grant to mitigate impacts to Sage-grouse.**

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

*Documentation of answer and explanation:*

**Yes, we have worked with NDOW and the proponent to define stipulations in the right-of-way grant to reduce the impacts towards Sage-grouse. There are three known active leks within less than three miles of the proposed action. Work completed between the March 1 to June 30 Breeding Season (lekking and nesting) will occur between 10 a.m. and sundown, Pacific Time.**

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

*Documentation of answer and explanation:*

**Yes, the proposed action will have a temporary disturbance area of 0.105 acres and given that the fiber optic cable will be buried it will have no permanent disturbance. The 0.105 acres of temporary disturbance for the proposed action will be within the existing 4wd road and transmission line disturbance.**

5. Are public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

*Documentation of answer and explanation:*

**Yes, the required public involvement was done during the NEPA process in the above mentioned EA.**

***D. Persons/Agencies, BLM Staff Consulted***

*Enter Specialist Name, Title, Resource and secure their initials*

Name	Title	Representing	Initials
Beth Bigelow	Archaeologist	BLM	BB
John Daniel	Hydrologist	BLM	JD
Ken Wilkenson	Wildlife Biologist	BLM	KW
<b>Note:</b> Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.			

**Preparer:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Project Lead - /s/ Elisabeth Puentes**

**Date:**

**7/16/2014**

**NEPA Compliance Review:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**NEPA Coordinator - /s/ Victoria Anne**

**Date**

**7/16/2014**

### Conclusion

☒ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

(Use surname or initials for documents placed on web)

---

Responsible Official: **/s/ Richard E. Adams**

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
7/16/2014

Note: The signed Conclusion on this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Project Lead: \_\_\_\_\_

BLM - NEVADA - Elko District Office  
 INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM SCOPING RECORD

File Code: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Resources Considered						
ELEMENT/ RESOURCE	Appropriate Specialist	Not Present	Present/ Not Affected	Present and Affected	BLM Guidance	Initials/Date
<b>Human Concerns</b>						
Air Quality					MS 7300.40 CFR 93 subpart B	
Cultural Resources					MS 8100	
Environmental Justice					H-1601-1	
Human Health & Safety					MS 9011	
Native American Religious Concerns					MS 8100 H-8160-1	
<b>Wildlife/Animal Concerns</b>						
Migratory Birds					50 CFR 10.17	
Threatened/Endangered Species					MS 6840	
<b>Other Concerns</b>						
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)					MS 1613	
Farm Land -Prime/Unique					7 CFR 658.4	
Floodplains					MS 7260	
Forests and Rangelands (HFRA)					HFRA 2003	
Non-Native and Noxious Species					MS 9015 517 DM1	
Wastes, Hazardous/Solid					MS 9180, MS 9183	
Water Quality					MS 7420, MS 9184	
Wetlands, Riparian Zones					MS 6740	
Wild & Scenic Rivers					MS 8014	
Wilderness					43 CFR 6300, H-8550-1, MS 8560	
<b>Human Concerns</b>						
Access						
Engineering						
Fire Management						
Mining/Minerals						
Realty - Land Use						
Recreation						
Social or Economic						
Visual Resources						
<b>Wildlife/Animal Concerns</b>						
Aquatic species						
Livestock Grazing						
Sensitive Species						
Wildlife						
Wild Horses						
<b>Other Concerns</b>						
Climate Change (GHG's, Wildfire, Disease, etc.)						
Energy (Gas, Oil, Wind)						
Soils						

[1] See Statute: NV-2009-030, BLM Manual, regulation or order that may require an element be addressed in a NV BLM EA or EIS.